



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

A 18, where he introduces into the text Bentley's conjecture ἕμμι θεοὶ μὲν δοῖεν (which Nauck leaves among the footnotes). So he reads with Ahrens, Γ 3, ἦντε περ κλαγγὴ γεράνων πέλει οὐρανόθι πρῶ (instead of πρὸ); this again Nauck had left at the bottom of the page. A 15, he reads with Nauck, χρυσέω ἄν σκήπτρῳ. In E 638, ἀλλ' οἶόν τινά φασι βίην 'Ηρακλείην, he reads ἀλλοῖον with Tyrannio, Bekker, Nauck (against Aristarchus and the rest). But, T 107, he reads ψευστήσεις, with Aristarchus and the MSS, not ψεύστης εἰς.

He reads Δύκαστον, B 647 (with Aristarchus), although the people of the place said Λυκάστος, but Καρησός, M 20 (against Aristarchus, but with the Cyzicenes of the Alexandrian time). So he varies from Aristarchus in reading θαμειαί, A 52; ταφείαι, T 357; πτέρυγος, B 316; πεφύοντα, Π 827 (against all MSS, Düntzer, Faesi). In all these points of accentuation (except Καρησός, which is, perhaps, a misprint, for τέ follows, and the corrector may have thought one accent enough for the name), he agrees with Bekker's 1858 edition, as well as in τῶ (τῷ, La Roche), ἡ θέμις ἐστίν, τιμῆς, I 605 (τιμῆς, La Roche, Nauck). He writes Τρῳάς, E 461 (with La Roche, Nauck—Τρῳας, Bekker), θνησκον, A 383 (with Nauck), γινώσκω, E 815 (with Nauck—γινώσκω, Bekker and La Roche). He does not follow Ven. A in reading τῆνδε, τοῦσδε, ἀλα δέ κτλ. He admits elision at the close of the verse, Θ 206 (with Düntzer and La Roche, against all other modern editions). He has kept the acute accent on oxytones at the end of the verse. He is not so determined as Nauck to introduce the diaeresis wherever it is possible. He reads κούλος, θείος, but 'Ηρακλείη. He calls attention to the excess of synizesis in the ordinary text of the poems, and to the ease with which much of this may be removed, as A 1, Πηληιάδα' Ἀχιλλῆος (where he was preceded by Payne Knight's ΠηλεΨιάδαΨ'), but does not introduce this into the text; nor does he write the genitive of the second declension in -οο for -οῦ or -οιο, except where it is demanded, not merely desired, by the verse. So he writes δΨέος, but δειδῶ (not δειδία or δέδΨια). His critical apparatus is based upon that of La Roche.

This edition gives us, then, a conservative, conciliating view of the composition of the Homeric poems with a text which makes the various layers clear at a glance, with convenient references to passages where verses are repeated, and with a critical apparatus which is sufficient for ordinary work. In both higher and lower criticism it is probable that the editor's procedure will seem too conservative for the more advanced, and too radical in its changes and views for those who do not go back of Aristarchus. A large number of scholars, however, will enjoy the material which is here gathered, and will approve in the main of the editor's position and course.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

---

Beitraege zu einer Geschichte der Griechischen Sprache, von DR. KARL KRUMBACHER. Weimar, 1884.

Germanic philology, by the genius and industry of Jacob Grimm, was supplied, almost at the outset, with a history of its subject; for his "Deutsche Grammatik," of which the four volumes appeared between 1819 and 1837, was virtually an organic history of the Germanic tongues. The special "Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache" appeared in 1848. It is no matter for surprise if

other groups of languages have been less fortunate. No Romance scholar was as well qualified to traverse the distance from the Latin of the Twelve Tables to the latest developments of Italian, French, Spanish, and the dialects belonging under these heads, as Grimm was to cover the ground between the termini naturally given in Gothic and Modern German. The philologies of Italic and Italian, Roman and Romance, have been as two nations of kindred blood, separated from each other by an unpierced *Mont Cenis* which Latinists and Romanticists have just begun to tunnel. A spirit of rigid classicism, of very dubious beneficence even in its pedagogical effect, has had its share in thus delaying the progress of the cause of historical philology. Yet within the bounds of the ancient idiom the alterations and modifications of Latin speech have been observed. The familiar divisions are historical. It is a work of the character of Sittl's "*Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der Lateinischen Sprache*" that breaks new ground.

In the much narrower field of Greek, the untilled soil predominates altogether, extending in one unbroken area from the last examples of Attic prose to the language spoken to-day. The singularly clear demarcation of the representative dialects has drawn the attention of grammarians to the phenomena of geographical variety rather than to those of historical change. The study of the latter has, indeed, been neglected to such a degree that Gustav Meyer is forced to close his Greek grammar with the admission that neither the *κοινή* nor Hellenistic Greek have received any adequate treatment, while for the later periods down to this day everything is yet to be done. As the author of the "*Beitraege*" puts it, "The variety of points of view and the thoroughness of the studies made are in direct proportion to the age of our linguistic documents." The introduction aptly points out what injury has accrued to the fruitful study of Middle and Modern Greek from the fact of its having been left to untrained enthusiasts, Greek and foreign. To identify living forms with classic and even pre-Hellenic phenomena was too delightful an exercise not to be indulged in by the school classicist who had haply stumbled upon Modern Greek, as well as by the dilettante whose ambition was to confound the professional scholar and his affectation of superiority the more utterly, the richer the vein of precious ore, unsuspected until thus pointed out, could be proved. The development of intervening ages was quietly ignored; as elsewhere, phonetic law was transformed to a monkey-wrench, adjustable to any nut. Even Foy's *Lautsystem der Griechischen Vulgaersprache*, Leipzig, 1879, betrays the influence of this dangerous tendency, that ran riot in Mullach's *Grammatik der Griechischen Vulgaersprache* and other works. Some were innocent of any historical considerations. A French writer ascribes the similarity between Modern Greek syntax and French to the education of so many young Greeks in French lycées. Some years ago, before mediaeval texts had been collated and published, either in the collections of C. Sathas, E. Legrand, and W. Wagner, or separately, neglect of the mediaeval stage of linguistic development was excusable; now, it is time that the method that had been productive of so good results in Romance philology, of tracing the origin of modern forms back to low and vulgar Latin, be followed in the range of Greek. "It is only by accompanying sound, form, word, and meaning through the whole course of development, and by tracing the action of phonetic laws, of

analogy, and of similar influences to their beginnings," that a scientific understanding of the present stage of the language and of its historical growth can be reached.

Krumbacher very sensibly deprecates the usage introduced by Mullach, and recently adhered to by Foy, of supplanting the honest and proper designation of the language in its present stage as modern, by a misleading use of the term Vulgar Greek, which should be restricted to denoting the phenomena peculiar to the uncultivated tongue.

The two specimen articles—for only a part of the study submitted to the philosophical faculty of the University of Munich is published—demonstrate the author's ability to conduct linguistic investigations with historical acumen. The first, "*ἄκμην—ἄκόμα*," defends the derivation of the Modern Greek *ἄκόμα*, or *ἄκόμη*=*ἔτι* from the old adverbial *ἄκμην*—against Ascoli and G. Meyer, by whom it was pronounced a form borrowed from the Romance, a congener of the Provençal *com*, *coma*, Romanian *acu*, *acum*, *acuma*, Friulian *acumó*=*now*, *just*, which are descended from Latin *eccu' modo*. A full and careful collection of examples of the use, in Ancient, Modern, and Mediaeval Greek, of the forms the relationship of which is questioned, in itself constitutes a chain of presumptive evidence; for they show the word in continuous use from the best days of Attic prose to the present day. *ἄκμην* for *ἔτι* occurs in Ancient Greek, from Xen. Anab. IV 3, 36, to Silkon's inscription of the latter half of the sixth century of our era, CIG 5072, as a vulgarism avoided by most authors, and consequently condemned by the Atticists. In Middle Greek, *ἄκμην*, *ἄκμή*, *ἄκομή*, *ἄκόμη*, *ἄκόμα*, are the forms indifferently used in place of the obsolescent *ἔτι* and *προσέτι*. The ordinary Modern Greek forms *ἄκόμη* and *ἄκόμα*, as well as their equivalents in the Cappadocian, Pontic, and Italo-Greek dialects respectively: *ἄκόμε*, *ἄκόμεν*, *ἄκόμαν*, *ἄκόμην*—*ἄκομή*, *ἄκομήνε*—*ἄκούμα*, are employed in the same sense as the mediaeval forms cited; the signification of "not yet," in reply to a negative question, like French *encore* for *pas encore*, is a recent but natural development. Of five phonetic changes undergone by the old adverb *ἄκμην*—loss of final *ν*, gain of an epenthetic *ο* or *ον*, recession of the accent, accrescence of a new *ν* and a vowel *ε* or *ο*—three of them not common to all the dialects, only two present any difficulty. The epenthetic vowel is shown to be common in later Greek as in Latin; the triplet *δραχμή*: *drachuma*: *δραχουμή* may be put beside *ἄκμην*: *Acume* (proper name found in several Latin inscriptions): *ἄκομή*. In a language that permits the co-existence of three accentuations of one word, *παρεκεῖ*, *παρέκει*, *πάρεκει*, as Modern Greek does, the shifting of an accent from an original to an epenthetic vowel cannot be regarded as astonishing or abnormal. K. judiciously observes that "As soon as the epenthetic vowel has been so incorporated with the word, that the linguistic feeling of later generations fails to recognize the inorganic and extraneous nature of the invading element, the danger of a transposition of the accent is become as great as it is in any other word, in which all the vowels are original." How great this danger was is shown in the eight page contribution "Zur Geschichte des Griechischen Accentes." In its dense array of facts, many questions regarding both ancient and modern phenomena are suggested, as, for instance, whether, as Ahrens supposed, the paroxytone accent of third pers. pl. imperf. and aorist in the Doric dialect is due to the lost

terminal consonant—*ἐλέγον(τ)*, or may be ascribed to the contagious influence of the other plural forms, *ἐλέγομεν*, etc., which have had an analogous effect on the forms of the Tsakonic aorist *ἐπέσσαν*, *ἐλέγον*, *ἐλέγεσ*, etc.

In a third instructive chapter, under the heading "*γυνή, γυνῆς*, etc.," the author catches and dissects a variety of specimens of abnormal case forms that are found in mediaeval Greek literature of a certain class, the brood of pedantry and ignorance, "Asses' Attic," to paraphrase a Modern Greek proverb. His best reservoir is the old translation of the Iliad by the "incomparable" Hermoniakos, whose compromises between his desire to make himself understood and his horror of vulgarity produce such ludicrous abortions as the case forms *ὁ, τοῦ, τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων, ἡ, τῆς, τὴν θυγάτηρ, τοῦ Πίνδαρος, τὴν λάμπων* (*i. e. λάμπουσιν*). It is difficult to define with precision the boundaries between mere malformation and living usage. There is no difference between the low Latin plusiores and the low Greek *μειζότερος* but that one dies and the other lives. The author concludes by giving a few select observations on comparatives and superlatives, pronouns, etc., such as illustrate the phenomenon of malformation. Examples from the verb are reserved for later publication in their proper context.

Dr. Krumbacher's familiar acquaintance with Greeks, scholarly and otherwise, besides giving him a superior command of the living language, has enabled him to control by original and unimpeachable evidence, the often reckless propositions of his predecessors in the field of Neograeca. His philological training under such teachers as K. Halm, W. von Christ, Ernst Kuhn and Ed. Wölfflin, the comprehensive study of mediaeval documents, and the strict historical method of which he has given the example, are sure to bear fruit for both classical and modern philology. His habilitation as Privatdozent of Middle and Modern Greek at the University of Munich, and recent appointment to the Bavarian Fellowship of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens, promise a more undivided attention than he could hitherto give to a subject of philological investigation that has suffered from neglect and incompetent treatment long enough. Whether a satisfactory volume on Low, Middle and Modern Greek, such as was half promised by Gustav Meyer (Greek Grammar, preface, p. viii), nearly five years ago (May, 1880), can be added to the Breitkopf and Härtel series of Indogermanic grammars before some years have been devoted to the accumulation of well-sifted material, is very doubtful. Meanwhile, it is to be hoped that Dr. Krumbacher will rid himself of an unsalutary residue of the Mullachian idea that his pages still evince. Thus, there is a lack of historical sense when the consideration of a multitude of examples of the use of *ἀκμήν* leads him to an indiscriminating endorsement and application of Hesychios' brief gloss *Ἀκμήν· ἔτι* as the last word of lexicography. Not to dwell on two passages in Polybios, XIV 4, *οἱ δ' ἀκμήν ἔτι μεθυσκόμενοι καὶ πίνοντες* . . . XV 6, *τούς δ' ἀκμήν ἔτι καὶ νῦν κινδυνεύειν*, where K. is reduced to changing the text by expunging *ἔτι*, both in the quotation from Demostros, Plutarch, de fluviis, IX 2, *Μαϊνδρόρος ἀκμήν στρατηγὸς χειροτονηθεὶς*, and Polyb. XII 4, 14 (ed. Schweighäuser, Tom. III, p. 391), *ἀμλλώμενα (τὰ κτήνη, hogs) περὶ τὸν καρπὸν, ὅταν ἀκμήν ἀρχῇται βεῖν*, the rendering of *ἀκμήν* by *ἔτι* is impossible. The latter example having, through Lobeck's misquotation, Phrynichi Ecloga, p. 123, escaped K.'s scrutiny, he proposes an

absurd "noch im anfang des fliessens begriffen." The absence of any temporal signification in such examples, ἀκμήν designating fulness of military authority, plentiful dropping of acorns, indicates clearly enough that the adverb was developed out of the related secondary sense of the substantive ("De viribus pollentibus s. rebus validissimis et ad summum evectis," Thes. Ling. Gr. s. v.). Substantive, verb or adverb can be used to express the same idea; Xen. Cyr. VII 2, 20, ὁ δὲ ἄριστος γενόμενος ἐν ἀκμῇ τοῦ βίου ἀπώλετο · Thuk. V. 17, ἕως ἐγὼ τε ἐτι ἀκμάζω · Aretaeus, (as quoted by K., p. 22), μαζοὶ δὲ εἰς ὄγκον αἰρονται, ὁκόσοι νέοι ἀκμῇν ὄντες ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ τῆς ἡλικίας · CIG, IV 6864 (late epigram), ἀγαθὸς δ' ἐν ἅπασιν νομισθεὶς Θρέπτος ἀκμῇν νέος ὧν ᾤχετ' ἐς ἡμέθους. The proposition "mit ἀκμή=spitze, blüte, entscheidungspunkt, kulminationspunkt ist der begriff des eben noch gegenwärtigen, gleichsam des zenithpunktes im gegensatze zur vergangenheit und zukunft, nahe verwandt," is no more to the point, in this case, than the irrelevant citation of ἐπ' ἀκμῆς ἐλθεῖν from the Hercules Furens. The transition of ἀκμῇν, by gradations, to a synonym of ἔτι, is easy enough; the hipparion, by losing unnecessary toes, becomes a horse. K. ignores all gradation, and does not see the vestiges of the defunct toes on the animal's cannon bone. To account for the wane of ἐτι before ἀκμῇν he operates on the overworn fulcrum of iotacism; ἔτι ran risk, he would persuade us, of being taken for ἔτη, ἔτει, ἦτοι, or even αἰτεῖ · whereas it had the advantage of every figurative expression over a dry equivalent. If some lack of discrimination is shown in this chapter, it must be recognized that the arbitrary subtleties put forward by certain accomplished grammarians, Rost, Kühner, Krüger, Lobeck, are refuted with sound arguments. The whole study, indeed, is characterized rather by excess of caution than by boldness. For example, the author, in one case, foregoes, out of reverence for the classicism of Isokrates, an indulgence in text-alteration to which he is sorely tempted, although the *ad Demonicum*, in which the passage occurs, has been pronounced spurious by many critics, Stephens, Koraës, Benseler, and now Blass.

ALFRED EMERSON.

---

Elemente der phonetik und orthoepie des Deutschen, Englischen und Franzosischen mit rücksicht auf die bedürfnisse der lehrpraxis, von WILHELM VIETOR. Heilbronn, Henning, 1884. VIII, 271, 8vo.

Workers in phonetics have just cause for encouragement when they look back over the progress of their new science within the last ten years. Not only have their principles been more firmly established by closer observation, further differentiation and illustration, but the interests of their cause have been so strongly pushed by energetic converts as to already make themselves felt in the province of the practical teacher.

It is now nearly thirty years (1856) since Merkel gave to the world his *Anthropophonik*,<sup>1</sup> and Brücke published the first edition of his *Grundzüge*,<sup>2</sup> both

<sup>1</sup> Merkel, C. L.: Anatomie und Physiologie des menschlichen Stimm- und Sprachorgans (Anthropophonik), Leipzig, 1856.

<sup>2</sup> Brücke, Ernst: Grundzüge der Physiologie und Systematik der Sprachlaute. Wien, 1856, 2te aufl. 1876.